arXiv:1701.02563v2 [math.PR] 25 Jan 2017

Brownian Motion on the Sierpinski Gasket and a Stochastic Maximum Principle

Xuan Liu*

Abstract

In this paper, we establish a martingale representation theorem for the Brownian filtration on the infinite Sierpinski gasket, and the exponential integrability of the quadratic process of the representing martingale. We prove that the martingale dimension of the infinite Sierpinski gasket is one. As a consequence, the existence and uniqueness of solutions of a class of backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs) on the infinite Sierpinski gasket are obtained. Using BSDEs, we further establish a stochastic maximum principle for stochastic control problems on both the finite and the infinite Sierpinski gaskets, which has different behaviour from its counterpart on Euclidean spaces due to the singularity between certain measures.

1 Introduction

Recently, to study non-linear analysis on the finite (or compact) Sierpinski gasket, X. Liu and Z. Qian [8] developed a theory of backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs) on the finite Sierpinski gasket. BSDEs and related stochastic analysis on fractals, though initially considered as efficient tools to treat quasi-linear parabolic PDEs on fractals, also have interests on their own from a mathematical finance point of view. Several interesting mathematical finance problems are formulated as stochastic control problems on Euclidean spaces, which are based upon the assumption that uncertainties in financial models are sourced from Brownian filtration on Euclidean spaces. However, it had been widely observed from the real data that many financial time series exhibit fractal behaviours (see, for example, M. Ausloos *et al.* [1], Y. Dong and J. Wang [3], B. B. Mandelbrot [9], and *etc.*), which suggests the possibility that uncertainties in the markets might come from filtrations exhibiting fractal structures. Therefore, it is of significance to consider stochastic control problems for controlled systems with noise coming from filtrations determined by the diffusions on fractals. Since the natural analogue of Euclidean spaces are infinite (or σ-compact) fractals (rather than the finite ones), it is interesting to establish a corresponding theory on infinite fractals.

The motivation of this paper is therefore to: (i) extend the results in X. Liu and Z. Qian [8] to the infinite Sierpinski gasket; (ii) establish a stochastic maximum principle for stochastic control problems on the finite and infinite Sierpinski gaskets, where uncertainties in the controlled dynamic systems are sourced from the Brownian filtrations. It turns out that, in contrast to its counterpart on Euclidean spaces, the stochastic maximum principle on the Sierpinski gaskets consists of two necessity equations rather than a single one (see S. Peng [10], J. Yong and X. Zhou [12, Section 3.2]). As we shall see, this is due to the singularity between measures.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce notations which will be enforced throughout this paper, and review some related results in literature. The main results of

*Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford OX2 6GG, United Kingdom. Email: xuan.liu@maths.ox.ac.uk.

this paper is formulated and collected in Section 3. Section 4 is devoted to two results on the Brownian motion on the infinite Sierpinski gasket: a martingale representation theorem and the exponential integrability of the quadratic process of the representing martingale. In Section 5, we establish the stochastic maximum principle for stochastic control problems on the finite and the infinite Sierpinski gasket. Though results of this paper are established for 2-dimensional Sierpinski gasket, we however believe that our results also hold for higher-dimensional cases, where argument in this paper should remain valid.

2 Notations

In this section, we introduce notations which will be enforced throughout this paper. We also review several results in literature needed in the following sections.

2.1 The Standard Dirichlet Form on the Finite Sierpinski Gasket

Let $\mathrm{V}_0 = \{p_1, p_2, p_3\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ with $p_1 = (0,0),\ p_2 = (1,0),\ p_3 = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})$, and $\mathrm{F}_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2,\ i = 1,2,3$ be the contraction mappings given by $F_i(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x + p_i),\ x \in \mathbb{R}^2,\ i = 1,2,3$. Define $\mathrm{V}_m,\ m \in \mathbb{N}$ inductively by $\mathrm{V}_{m+1} = F_1(\mathrm{V}_m) \cup F_2(\mathrm{V}_m) \cup F_3(\mathrm{V}_m),\ m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mathrm{V}_* = \bigcup_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{V}_m$. The (2-dimensional) *finite Sierpinski gasket* is defined to be the closure $\mathbb{S} = \overline{\mathrm{V}}_*$ of V_* in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Let $\tilde{\Omega} = \{\omega = \omega_1\omega_2\cdots : \omega_i \in \{1,2,3\},\ i \in \mathbb{N}_+\}$. For each $\omega = \omega_1\omega_2\cdots \in \tilde{\Omega}$, let $[\omega]_m = \omega_1\cdots\omega_m,\ m \in \mathbb{N}_+$, and denote $\tilde{\Omega}_{[\omega]_0} = \tilde{\Omega},\ \tilde{\Omega}_{[\omega]_m} = \{\omega' \in \tilde{\Omega} : [\omega']_m = [\omega]_m\}$, and $\mathbb{S}_{[\omega]_0} = \mathbb{S},\ \mathbb{S}_{[\omega]_m} = F_{\omega_m} \circ \cdots \circ F_{\omega_1}(\mathbb{S}),\ m \in \mathbb{N}_+$. In view of the contractivity of $F_i,\ i = 1,2,3$, it is easily seen that, for each $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$, the set $\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{S}_{[\omega]_m}$ contains a unique element $\pi(\omega) \in \mathbb{S}$. It can be shown that the map $\pi : \tilde{\Omega} \to \mathbb{S},\ \omega \mapsto \pi(\omega)$ is surjective, and $\mathrm{card}\big(\pi^{-1}(x)\big) = 1$ if and only if $x \in \mathrm{V}_0 \cup (\mathbb{S} \backslash \mathrm{V}_*)$ (see J. Kigami [6, Lemma 1.3.14]). Clearly, $\pi\big(\tilde{\Omega}_{[\omega]_m}\big) = \mathbb{S}_{[\omega]_m}$ for each $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega},\ m \in \mathbb{N}$.

For a given set V, we denote by $\ell(\mathrm{V})$ the space of all real-valued functions on V. Define the relation $\underset{m}{\sim}$ on $\hat{\mathrm{V}}_m$ by: $x \underset{m}{\sim} y$ if and only if $|x - y| = 2^{-m}$. The *standard Dirichlet form* $(\mathscr{E}, \mathscr{F}(\mathbb{S}))$ on the finite Sierpinski gasket $\mathbb{S}$ is defined by

$$\begin{cases} \mathscr{E}(u,v) = \lim\limits_{m\to\infty} \mathscr{E}^{(m)}(u,v), \quad u,v \in \mathscr{F}(\mathbb{S}), \\ \mathscr{F}(\mathbb{S}) = \Big\{u \in \ell(\mathbb{S}) : \lim\limits_{m\to\infty} \mathscr{E}^{(m)}(u,u) < \infty\Big\}, \end{cases}$$

where the forms $\mathscr{E}^{(m)},\ m \in \mathbb{N}$ are given by

$$\mathscr{E}^{(m)}(u,v) = \Big(\frac{5}{3}\Big)^m \sum_{x \underset{m}{\sim} y} \big(u(x) - u(y)\big)\big(v(x) - v(y)\big), \quad u,v \in \ell(\mathrm{V}_m).$$

Let ν be the *self-similar measure* on $\mathbb{S}$ with weight $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$, that is, ν is the unique Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{S}$ such that $\nu(\mathbb{S}_{[\omega]_m}) = 3^{-m}$ for each $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$ and each $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the form $\mathscr{E}$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathbb{S}; \nu)$, and $\mathscr{F}(\mathbb{S})$ is the corresponding *Dirichlet space*.

According to the general theory of Dirichlet forms and Markov processes (see M. Fukushima *et al.* [5, Chapter 7]), associated to the form $(\mathscr{E}, \mathscr{F}(\mathbb{S}))$ there exists a standard Hunt process $\mathbf{M} = \big(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \{X_t\}_{t\in[0,\infty]}, \{\mathbb{P}_x\}_{x\in\mathbb{S}\cup\{\Delta\}}\big)$ with state space $\mathbb{S}$, where Δ is the "*cemetery*" of $\mathbb{S}$. The process $\{X_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ is called *Brownian motion* on $\mathbb{S}$. The semigroup of $\{X_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ will be denoted by $\{P_t\}_{t\geq 0}$.

Let $\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{S})$ be the family of all Borel probability measures on $\mathbb{S}$. For each $\lambda \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{S})$, the probability measure $\mathbb{P}_\lambda$ on Ω is defined by $\mathbb{P}_\lambda(A) = \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mathbb{P}_x(A)\lambda(dx),\ A \in \mathscr{F}$. The expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}_\lambda$ will be denoted by $\mathbb{E}_\lambda$. Let $\mathscr{F}_t^0 = \sigma(X_r : r \leq t),\ t \geq 0$, $\mathscr{F}_t^\lambda$ the $\mathbb{P}_\lambda$-completion of $\mathscr{F}_t^0$ in $\mathscr{F}$, and $\{\mathscr{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ the *minimal completed admissible filtration* of $\{X_t\}_{t\geq 0}$, that is, $\mathscr{F}_t = \bigcap_{\lambda\in\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{S})} \mathscr{F}_t^\lambda,\ t \geq 0$.

2.2 The Standard Dirichlet Form on the Infinite Sierpinski Gasket

Let $\mathbb{S} \subseteq [0,1]^2$ be the (unit) finite Sierpinski gasket. For any $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, let $-A$ be the reflection of A with respect to the y-axis. Then the *infinite Sierpinski gasket* $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ is defined to be $\hat{\mathbb{S}} = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} F_1^{-n}\big(\mathbb{S} \cup (-\mathbb{S})\big)$. Denote by $\hat{\mathrm{V}}_m$ the m-vertices set of $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$, that is, $\hat{\mathrm{V}}_m = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} F_1^{-n}\big(\mathrm{V}_m \cup (-\mathrm{V}_m)\big)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We also denote $\hat{\mathrm{V}}_* = \bigcup_{m=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mathrm{V}}_m$.

Clearly, there exist translations τ_i, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ of $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\tau_0 = \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{R}^2}$,

$$\hat{\mathbb{S}} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} \tau_i(\mathbb{S}), \quad \tau_i(\mathbb{S}) \cap \tau_j(\mathbb{S}) \subseteq \hat{\mathrm{V}}_0, \ i \neq j.$$

Throughout this paper, we will fix a choice of the translations τ_i satisfying the properties above.

Define the relation $\underset{m}{\sim}$ on $\hat{\mathrm{V}}_m$ by: $x \underset{m}{\sim} y$ if and only if $|x-y| = 2^{-m}$. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $u, v \in \ell(\hat{\mathrm{V}}_m)$, let

$$\hat{\mathscr{E}}^{(m)}(u,v) = \Big(\frac{5}{3}\Big)^m \sum_{x \underset{m}{\sim} y} \big(u(x)-u(y)\big)\big(v(x)-v(y)\big),$$

whenever the sum on the right hand side converges. It can be easily shown that $\hat{\mathscr{E}}^{(m)}(u,u)$ is non-decreasing in m for any $u \in \ell(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$. The *standard Dirichlet form* $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}, \mathscr{F}(\hat{\mathbb{S}}))$ on the infinite Sierpinski gasket $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ is then defined by

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\mathscr{E}}(u,v) = \lim\limits_{m\to\infty} \hat{\mathscr{E}}^{(m)}(u,v), \quad u,v \in \mathscr{F}(\hat{\mathbb{S}}), \\ \mathscr{F}(\hat{\mathbb{S}}) = \Big\{ u \in \ell(\hat{\mathbb{S}}) : \lim\limits_{m\to\infty} \hat{\mathscr{E}}^{(m)}(u,u) < \infty \Big\}. \end{cases}$$

Let $\hat{\nu}$ be the *self-similar measure* on $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ with weight $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$, that is, $\hat{\nu}$ is the unique Radon measure on $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ such that $\nu\big(\tau_i(\mathbb{S}_{[\omega]_m})\big) = 3^{-m}$ for each $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$ and each $i, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the form $\hat{\mathscr{E}}$ is a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(\hat{\mathbb{S}}; \hat{\nu})$, and $\mathscr{F}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$ is the corresponding *Dirichlet space*.

We denote by $\hat{\mathbf{M}} = \big(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathscr{F}}, \{\hat{X}_t\}_{t\in[0,\infty]}, \{\hat{\mathbb{P}}_x\}_{x\in\hat{\mathbb{S}}\cup\{\Delta\}}\big)$ the standard Hunt process associated with the form $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}, \mathscr{F}(\hat{\mathbb{S}}))$, and by $\{\hat{P}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ the semigroup of $\{\hat{X}_t\}$. The process $\{\hat{X}_t\}$ is called the *Brownian motion* on $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$. It can be easily shown that the diffusion $\{\hat{X}_t\}$ coincides with the Brownian motion constructed in M. T. Barlow and E. A. Perkins [2] as the limit of simple random walks on graphs.

In accordance with M. Fukushima *et al.* [5], we denote by $\mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$ the space of all functions which are locally in $\mathscr{F}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$. For any $u, v \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$, the mutual energy measure of u and v is denoted by $\hat{\mu}_{\langle u,v\rangle}$.

Let $\mathscr{P}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$ be the family of all Borel probability measures on $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$. For each $\lambda \in \mathscr{P}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$, the probability measure $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_\lambda$ on $\hat{\Omega}$ is defined by $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_\lambda(A) = \int_{\hat{\mathbb{S}}} \hat{\mathbb{P}}_x(A)\lambda(dx)$, $A \in \hat{\mathscr{F}}$. The expectation with respect to $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_\lambda$ will be denoted by $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_\lambda$. Let $\hat{\mathscr{F}}_t^0 = \sigma\big(\hat{X}_r : r \leq t\big)$, $t \geq 0$, $\hat{\mathscr{F}}_t^\lambda$ the $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_\lambda$-completion of $\hat{\mathscr{F}}_t^0$ in $\hat{\mathscr{F}}$, and $\{\hat{\mathscr{F}}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ the minimal completed admissible filtration of $\{\hat{X}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$.

2.3 The Kusuoka Measure on the Finite Sierpinski Gasket

Let

$$\mathbf{A}_1 = \frac{1}{5}\begin{bmatrix} 5 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \ \mathbf{A}_2 = \frac{1}{5}\begin{bmatrix} 2 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 5 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \ \mathbf{A}_3 = \frac{1}{5}\begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 5 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{P} = \frac{1}{3}\begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix},$$

and let $\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{P}$, $i = 1,2,3$. Let $\tilde{\mu}$ be the unique probability measure on $\tilde{\Omega}$ such that $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{\Omega}_{[\omega]_m}) = \left(\frac{5}{3}\right)^m \text{trace}\left(\mathbf{Y}^t_{\omega_1}\cdots\mathbf{Y}^t_{\omega_m}\mathbf{Y}_{\omega_m}\cdots\mathbf{Y}_{\omega_1}\right)$, $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$. The *Kusuoka measure* μ on $\mathbb{S}$ is then defined to be the push-forward $\mu = \tilde{\mu}\circ\pi^{-1}$. In other words, μ is the unique Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{S}$ such that $\mu\left(\mathbb{S}_{[\omega]_m}\right) = \tilde{\mu}\left(\tilde{\Omega}_{[\omega]_m}\right)$, $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$.

We end this section with a review on the representing martingale on the finite Sierpinski gasket, of which the construction will be needed later. Let

$$\mathbf{Z}_m(\omega) = \text{trace}(\mathbf{Y}^t_{\omega_1}\cdots\mathbf{Y}^t_{\omega_m}\mathbf{Y}_{\omega_m}\cdots\mathbf{Y}_{\omega_1})^{-1}\cdot\mathbf{Y}^t_{\omega_1}\cdots\mathbf{Y}^t_{\omega_m}\mathbf{Y}_{\omega_m}\cdots\mathbf{Y}_{\omega_1},\ \omega\in\tilde{\Omega}.$$

Then $\{\mathbf{Z}_m\}_{m\ge1}$ is a $\tilde{\mu}$-martingale, and $\mathbf{Z} = \lim_{m\to\infty}\mathbf{Z}_m$ exists for $\tilde{\mu}$-a.s. (see S. Kusuoka [7, Proposition (1.7)]). Since $\text{card}(\pi^{-1}(x)) = 1$, $x \in \mathbb{S}\backslash V_*$ and $\mu(V_*) = 0$, $\mathbf{Z}(x) = \mathbf{Z}(\pi^{-1}(x))$ is well-defined for μ-a.e. $x \in \mathbb{S}$. The following result was first shown in S. Kusuoka [7, Theorem (5.4)] (see also X. Liu and Z. Qian [8, Theorem 2.1]).

Theorem 2.1. *(a) There exists an* $\mathbf{e} = (\mathbf{e}_1,\mathbf{e}_2,\mathbf{e}_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ *such that* $\langle\mathbf{e},\mathbf{e}\rangle = 1$ *and* $\mathbf{Z}(x)^{1/2}\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{Z}(x)^{1/2}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{e} \neq 0$ *for* μ*-a.e.* $x \in \mathbb{S}$*, where* $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ *is the Euclidean inner product on* $\mathbb{R}^3$*.*

(b) For any $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ *satisfying the property in (a), the martingale additive functional*

$$W_t = \int_0^t \langle\mathbf{e},\mathbf{Z}(X_r)\mathbf{e}\rangle^{-1/2}\, dM_r^{[H^0e]},\quad t\ge0, \tag{2.1}$$

does not depend on the particular choice of $\mathbf{e}$*, and has* μ *as its energy measure, where* $H^0\mathbf{e}$ *is the harmonic function on* $\mathbb{S}$ *with boundary value* $(H^0\mathbf{e})(p_i) = \mathbf{e}_i$, $i = 1,2,3$*, and* $M^{[u]}$ *is the martingale part in the Itô-Fukushima decomposition of* $u(X_t)$ *for* $u \in \mathscr{F}(\mathbb{S})$*. Moreover, for each* $u \in \mathscr{F}(\mathbb{S})$*, there exists a unique* $g \in L^2(\mathbb{S};\mu)$ *such that* $M_t^{[u]} = \int_0^t g(X_r)dW_r$, $t \ge 0$*.*

Definition 2.2. The martingale additive functional W given by (2.1) is called the *Brownian martingale* on $\mathbb{S}$.

Definition 2.3. For any $u \in \mathscr{F}(\mathbb{S})$, in view of Theorem 2.1, we define the gradient ∇u of u as the unique element in $L^2(\mathbb{S};\mu)$ such that $M_t^{[u]} = \int_0^t \nabla u(X_r)dW_r$, $t \ge 0$.

The following result on the singularity between the Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure induced by $t \mapsto \langle W\rangle_t$ and the Lebesgue measure on $[0,\infty)$ was proved in X. Liu and Z. Qian [8, Lemma 4.10].

Lemma 2.4. *The Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure* $d\langle W\rangle_t(\omega)$ *is singular to the Lebesgue measure dt on* $[0,\infty)$ $\mathbb{P}_\nu$*-a.e.* $\omega \in \Omega$*.*

3 Formulation of Main Results

The first main result of this paper is a martingale representation theorem on the infinite Sierpinski gasket. We start with the following definition.

Definition 3.1. The *Kusuoka measure* $\hat{\mu}$ on $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ is unique Radon measure on $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ such that $\hat{\mu}|_{\tau_i(\mathbb{S})} = \mu\circ\tau_i^{-1}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\tau_i : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are the translations introduced in Section 4.1.

Remark. It is well-known that the Kusuoka measure μ on $\mathbb{S}$ is non-atomic and singular to the self-similar measure ν on $\mathbb{S}$ (see S. Kusuoka [7, Corollary (2.15) and Example 1, p. 678]). Therefore, the Kusuoka measure $\hat{\mu}$ on $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ is also non-atomic and singular to the self-similar measure $\hat{\nu}$ on $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$.

With the above definition, we can now formulate the martingale representation theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *The martingale dimension of the Brownian filtration on the infinite Sierpinski gasket* $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ *is one. Moreover, there exists a martingale additive functional* $\hat{W}$ *such that* $\hat{W}$ *has the representing property and has* $\hat{\mu}$ *as its energy measure.*

Let $T \in (0,\infty)$ and $\lambda \in \mathscr{P}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$. By virtue of Theorem 3.2, using an argument similar to that of X. Liu and Z. Qian [8, Theorem 3.3], we have the existence and uniqueness of the BSDE

$$\begin{cases} dY_t = g(t,Y_t)dt + f(t,Y_t,Z_t)d\langle \hat{W}\rangle_t + Z_t d\hat{W}_t, \quad t \in [0,T),\ \hat{\mathbb{P}}_\lambda\text{-a.s.}, \\ Y_T = \xi, \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

where ξ is an $\hat{\mathscr{F}}_T^\lambda$-measurable random variable, and $f : [0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}$, $g : [0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}\times\Omega\to\mathbb{R}$ are measurable functions such that the processes $t\mapsto g(t,y)$ and $t\mapsto f(t,y,z)$ are $\{\hat{\mathscr{F}}_t^\lambda\}$-adapted for each $y,z\in\mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\beta\in\mathbb{R}^2$. Suppose that ξ, g, and f satisfy the following:*

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}_\lambda\left(\xi^2 e^{2\beta_1 T+2\beta_2\langle\hat{W}\rangle_T}\right)<\infty, \tag{3.2}$$

and, for $\mathbb{P}_\lambda$-a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$,

$$|g(t,y,\omega)-g(t,\bar{y},\omega)|\le K|y-\bar{y}|, \tag{3.3}$$

$$|f(t,y,z,\omega)-f(t,\bar{y},\bar{z},\omega)|\le K_0(|y-\bar{y}|+|z-\bar{z}|), \tag{3.4}$$

for all $t\in[0,T)$ and all $y,\bar{y},z,\bar{z}\in\mathbb{R}$, where $K,K_0>0$ are some constants.

(a) There exists at most one pair of $\{\hat{\mathscr{F}}_t^\lambda\}$-adapted processes satisfying (3.1) in the following sense: If (Y,Z) and $(\bar{Y},\bar{Z})$ are two pairs of $\{\hat{\mathscr{F}}_t^\lambda\}$-adapted processes satisfying (3.1), then

$$Y_t=\bar{Y}_t,\ t\in[0,T],\ \text{and}\ \int_0^T (Z_r-\bar{Z}_r)^2 d\langle\hat{W}\rangle_r=0,\quad \hat{\mathbb{P}}_\lambda\text{-a.s.}$$

(b) If (3.2)-(3.4) and the following

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}_\lambda\left(\int_0^T g(r,0)^2 e^{2\beta_1 r+2\beta_2\langle\hat{W}\rangle_r}dr\right)<\infty,\ \hat{\mathbb{E}}_\lambda\left(\int_0^T f(r,0,0)^2 e^{2\beta_1 r+2\beta_2\langle\hat{W}\rangle_r}d\langle\hat{W}\rangle_r\right)<\infty, \tag{3.5}$$

hold for sufficiently large $\beta_1,\beta_2>0$, then the (3.1) admits a unique solution (Y,Z). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\|(Y,Z)\|^2_{\mathscr{Y}_\lambda^\beta[0,T]}\le C\hat{\mathbb{E}}_\lambda\Big(&\xi^2 e^{2\beta_1 T+2\beta_2\langle\hat{W}\rangle_T}+\int_0^T g(r,0)^2 e^{2\beta_1 r+2\beta_2\langle\hat{W}\rangle_r}dr\\ &+\int_0^T f(r)^2 e^{2\beta_1 r+2\beta_2\langle\hat{W}\rangle_r}d\langle\hat{W}\rangle_r\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where $C>0$ is constant depending only on K,K_0 and β, and

$$\begin{aligned}\|(y,z)\|^2_{\mathscr{Y}_\lambda^\beta[0,T]}\triangleq\hat{\mathbb{E}}_\lambda\Big[\sup_{0\le t\le T}\Big(&y_t^2 e^{2\beta_1 t+2\beta_2\langle\hat{W}\rangle_t}+\int_t^\tau y_r^2 e^{2\beta_1 r+2\beta_2\langle\hat{W}\rangle_r}dr\\ &+\int_t^\tau\left(y_r^2+z_r^2\right)e^{2\beta_1 r+2\beta_2\langle\hat{W}\rangle_r}d\langle\hat{W}\rangle_r\Big)\Big]<\infty.\end{aligned}$$

The second main result of this paper concerns the stochastic maximum principle for stochastic control problems on the finite and infinite Sierpinski gaskets, where uncertainties in the controlled dynamic systems are sourced from the Brownian filtrations. For simplicity, we only give the formulate for the finite Sierpinski gasket. The case for infinite Sierpinski gasket can be formulated similarly.

Let $\lambda\in\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{S})$ satisfy $\lambda\ll\nu$. Let $(\mathbb{U},\rho)$ be a *decision space*, that is, $(\mathbb{U},\rho)$ is a given separable metric space. Let $h:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$, $f_1:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{U}\to\mathbb{R}$, $f_2:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{U}\to\mathbb{R}$ be Borel measurable functions. For any $\mathbb{U}$-valued $\{\mathscr{F}_t\}$-adapted process $u(t)$, we introduce the *cost functional*

$$J(u)\triangleq\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left(h(x(T))+\int_0^T f_1(t,x(t),u(t))dt+\int_0^T f_2(t,x(t),u(t))d\langle W\rangle_t\right), \tag{3.7}$$

where the *controlled process* $x(t)$ is given by the following SDE[1] on $\big(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \{\mathscr{F}_t^\lambda\}_{t\geq 0}, \mathbb{P}_\lambda\big)$:

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) = b_1(t,x(t),u(t))t + b_2(t,x(t),u(t))d\langle W\rangle_t \\ \qquad\quad + \sigma(t,x(t),u(t))dW_t, \quad t\in(0,T],\ \mathbb{P}_\lambda\text{-a.s.}, \\ x(0) = x_0, \end{cases} \tag{3.8}$$

where $\varphi : [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{U}\to\mathbb{R}$, $\varphi = b_1, b_2, \sigma$ are Borel measurable functions, and $x_0 \in \mathscr{F}_0^\lambda$.

Definition 3.4. Denote by $\mathscr{A}[0,T]$ the family of all $\mathbb{U}$-valued processes $u(t)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left(|h(x(T))| + \int_0^T |f_1(t,x(t),u(t))|dt + \int_0^T |f_2(t,x(t),u(t))|dt\right) < \infty, \tag{3.9}$$

where $x(t)$ is the controlled process given by (3.8). Any $u\in\mathscr{A}[0,T]$ is called an *admissible control,* and the pair $(x(\cdot),u(\cdot))$ is called an *admissible pair*.

We consider the following optimization problem

$$\underset{u\in\mathscr{A}[0,1]}{\text{minimize}}\ J(u). \tag{P}$$

Theorem 3.5. *Let $\lambda\in\mathscr{P}(\mathbb{S})$ be absolutely continuous with respect to ν. Assume that:*
(A.1)

$$\begin{cases} |\varphi(t,x,u)-\varphi(t,\hat{x},\hat{u})| \leq M|x-\hat{x}| + \rho(u,\hat{u}), & t\in[0,T],\ x,\hat{x}\in\mathbb{R},\ u,\hat{u}\in\mathbb{U}, \\ |\varphi(t,0,u)| \leq M, & t\in[0,T],\ u\in\mathbb{U}, \end{cases}$$

for $\varphi = b_1, b_2, \sigma, f_1, f_2, h$, and
(A.2)

$$|\partial_x\varphi(t,x,u)-\partial_x\varphi(t,\hat{x},\hat{u})| + |\partial_x^2\varphi(t,x,u)-\partial_x^2\varphi(t,\hat{x},\hat{u})| \leq M|x-\hat{x}| + \rho(u,\hat{u}),$$
$$t\in[0,T],\ x,\hat{x}\in\mathbb{R},\ u,\hat{u}\in\mathbb{U},$$

for $\varphi = b_1, b_2, \sigma, f_1, f_2, h$, where $M>0$ is a constant.

Suppose that $(\overline{x}(\cdot),\overline{u}(\cdot))$ is a solution of (P). Let $(p(\cdot),q(\cdot))$ and $(P(\cdot),Q(\cdot))$ be the solutions of the adjoint equations

$$\begin{cases} dp(t) = -[\partial_x b_1(t)p(t) - \partial_x f_1(t)]dt \\ \qquad\quad - [\partial_x b_2(t)p(t) + \partial_x\sigma(t)q(t) - \partial_x f_2(t)]d\langle W\rangle_t \\ \qquad\quad + q(t)dW_t, \qquad t\in[0,T],\ \mathbb{P}_\lambda\text{-a.s.}, \\ p(T) = -\partial_x h(\overline{x}(T)), \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} dP(t) = -[2\partial_x b_1(t)P(t) + \partial_x^2 b_1(t)p(t) - \partial_x^2 f_1(t)]dt \\ \qquad\quad - \big[\big(2\partial_x b_2(t) + \partial_x\sigma(t)^2\big)P(t) + \partial_x\sigma(t)Q(t) + \partial_x^2 b_2(t)p(t) + \partial_x^2\sigma(t)q(t) - \partial_x^2 f_2(t)\big]d\langle W\rangle_t \\ \qquad\quad + Q(t)dW_t, \qquad t\in[0,T],\ \mathbb{P}_\lambda\text{-a.s.}, \\ P(T) = -\partial_x^2 h(\overline{x}(T)), \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

[1]The existence and uniqueness of solutions of this SDE can be easily shown by an a priori estimate similar to (3.6).

and let $H_1(t,x,u)$, $H_2(t,x,u)$ *be the* Hamiltonians *defined by*

$$H_1(t,x,u) \triangleq b_1(t,x,u)p(t) - f_1(t,x,u),$$

$$H_2(t,x,u) \triangleq b_2(t,x,u)p(t) + \sigma(t,x,u)q(t) - f_2(t,x,u) + \frac{1}{2}[\sigma(t,x,u) - \sigma(t,x,\bar{u}(t))]^2 P(t).$$

Then

$$\begin{cases} H_1(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t)) = \max\limits_{u\in\mathbb{U}} H_1(t,\bar{x}(t),u), & \mathfrak{M}_1\text{-a.e.}, \\ H_2(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t)) = \max\limits_{u\in\mathbb{U}} H_2(t,\bar{x}(t),u), & \mathfrak{M}_2\text{-a.e.}, \end{cases} \tag{3.12}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{M}_1 = dt \times \mathbb{P}_\lambda, \tag{3.13}$$

and $\mathfrak{M}_2$ *is the unique measure on the optional* σ*-field*[2] *on* $[0,\infty)\times\Omega$ *such that*

$$\mathfrak{M}_2\big([\![\sigma_1,\sigma_2]\!]\big) = \mathbb{E}_\lambda\big(\langle W\rangle_{\sigma_2} - \langle W\rangle_{\sigma_1}\big), \tag{3.14}$$

for any $\{\mathscr{F}_t\}$*-stopping times* σ_1,σ_2 *with* $\sigma_1\le\sigma_2$*, where* $[\![\sigma_1,\sigma_2]\!] = \{(t,\omega)\in[0,\infty)\times\Omega : \sigma_1(\omega)\le t < \sigma_2(\omega)\}$.

Remark. (a) By $\lambda \ll \nu$ and Lemma 2.4, the measures $\mathfrak{M}_1$ and $\mathfrak{M}_2$ are mutually singular.

(b) Let $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}_1 + \mathfrak{M}_2$. In view of the similarity between the necessity equation for $H_1(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t))$ and Pontryagin's maximum principle, we call$u_1 = u\cdot\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_1}{d\mathfrak{M}}$ and $u_2 = u\cdot\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_2}{d\mathfrak{M}}$ the *quasi-deterministic* and *purely-stochastic* parts of the control $u(\cdot)$ respectively. Note that such separation phenomenon does not happen for the stochastic control problems on Euclidean spaces.

4 Brownian Martingale on the Infinite Sierpinski Gasket

In this section, we prove a martingale representation theorem (Theorem 3.2) for square-integrable $\{\hat{\mathscr{F}}_t\}$-martingales and the exponential integrability of quadratic process of the representing martingale.

4.1 Martingale Representations on the Infinite Sierpinski Gasket

Lemma 4.1. *For any* $u,v\in\mathscr{F}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$,

$$\hat{\mathscr{E}}(u,v) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\mathscr{E}\big(u\circ\tau_i, v\circ\tau_i\big). \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover, for any $u,v\in\mathscr{F}_{\rm loc}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$,

$$\hat{\mu}_{\langle u,v\rangle} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 1_{\tau_i(\mathbb{S})}\cdot\big(\mu_{\langle u\circ\tau_i, v\circ\tau_i\rangle}\circ\tau_i^{-1}\big). \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. It follows immediately from the definition that

$$\hat{\mathscr{E}}^{(m)}(u,v) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\mathscr{E}^{(m)}(u\circ\tau_i, v\circ\tau_i).$$

This implies that $\hat{\mathscr{E}}(u,v) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\mathscr{E}\big(u\circ\tau_i, v\circ\tau_i\big)$.

[2] That is, the σ-field on $[0,\infty)\times\Omega$ generated by the family of all right continuous left limit processes.

Moreover, for any $u \in \mathscr{F}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$ and any $f \in C_0(\hat{\mathbb{S}}) \cap \mathscr{F}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\hat{\mathbb{S}}} f\, d\hat{\mu}_{\langle u\rangle} &= 2\hat{\mathscr{E}}(fu,u) - \hat{\mathscr{E}}(f,u^2) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\big[2\mathscr{E}\big((f\circ\tau_i)(u\circ\tau_i), u\circ\tau_i\big) - \mathscr{E}\big(f\circ\tau_i, u^2\circ\tau_i\big)\big] \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}} f\circ\tau_i\, d\mu_{\langle u\circ\tau_i\rangle} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\int_{\tau_i(\mathbb{S})} f\, d\big(\mu_{\langle u\circ\tau_i\rangle}\circ\tau_i^{-1}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\hat{\mu}_{\langle u\rangle} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 1_{\tau_i(\mathbb{S})}\cdot\big(\mu_{\langle u\circ\tau_i\rangle}\circ\tau_i^{-1}\big)$ for each $u \in \mathscr{F}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$. This implies the other statement of the lemma. □

Define a function $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}:\hat{\mathbb{S}}\to\mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$ by $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\tau_i x) = \mathbf{Z}(x)$, $x\in\mathbb{S}$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathbf{e}\in\mathbb{R}^3$ satisfy the property (a) in Theorem 2.1 and be fixed, and define $\hat{H}^0\mathbf{e}\in\mathscr{F}_{\rm loc}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$ by setting $\big(\hat{H}^0\mathbf{e}\big)\circ\tau_i = H^0\mathbf{e}$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$.

We have the following representations for martingale additive functionals.

Proposition 4.2. *The martingale additive functional*

$$\hat{W}_t = \int_0^t \langle \mathbf{e}, \hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\hat{X}_r)\mathbf{e}\rangle^{-1/2}\, d\hat{M}_r^{[\hat{H}^0\mathbf{e}]}, \quad t\ge 0, \tag{4.3}$$

has $\hat{\mu}$ as its energy measure, where, for any $u\in\mathscr{F}_{\rm loc}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$, $\hat{M}^{[u]}$ is the martingale part in the Itô-Fukushima decomposition of $u(\hat{X}_t)$. Moreover, for each $u\in\mathscr{F}_{\rm loc}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$, there exists a unique $g\in L^2_{\rm loc}(\hat{\mathbb{S}};\hat{\mu})$ such that $\hat{M}_t^{[u]} = \int_0^t g(\hat{X}_r)\, d\hat{W}_r$, $t\ge 0$.

Proof. For any $f\in C_0(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{t\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{2t}\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{\hat{\nu}}\Big(\int_0^t f(\hat{X}_r)d\langle\hat{W}\rangle_r\Big) \\ &\quad= \lim_{t\downarrow 0}\frac{1}{2t}\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{\hat{\nu}}\left(\int_0^t f(\hat{X}_r)\langle\mathbf{e},\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\hat{X}_r)\mathbf{e}\rangle^{-1}\, d\langle\hat{M}_r^{[\hat{H}^0 e]}\rangle_r\right) \\ &\quad= \int_{\hat{\mathbb{S}}} f(x)\langle\mathbf{e},\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(x)\mathbf{e}\rangle^{-1}\,\hat{\mu}_{\langle\hat{H}^0 e\rangle}(dx) \\ &\quad= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}} f(\tau_i x)\langle\mathbf{e},\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\tau_i x)\mathbf{e}\rangle^{-1}\,\mu_{\langle\hat{H}^0\mathbf{e}\circ\tau_i\rangle}(dx) \\ &\quad= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}} f(\tau_i x)\langle\mathbf{e},\mathbf{Z}(x)\mathbf{e}\rangle^{-1}\,\mu_{\langle H^0\mathbf{e}\rangle}(dx) \\ &\quad= \int_{\hat{\mathbb{S}}} f(x)\,\hat{\mu}(dx).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\hat{W}_t$ has $\hat{\mu}$ as its energy measure.

We now turn to the second statement. It suffices to prove the result for $u\in\mathscr{F}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$. Clearly, $(u\circ\tau_i)|_{\mathbb{S}}\in\mathscr{F}(\mathbb{S})$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$. Let g_i be the unique element of $L^2(\mathbb{S};\mu)$ such that

$$M_t^{[u\circ\tau_i]} = \int_0^t g_i(X_r)\, dW_r,\ t\ge 0,\ i\in\mathbb{N}.$$

Define $g\in L^2_{\rm loc}(\hat{\mathbb{S}};\hat{\mu})$ by $g\circ\tau_i = g_i$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\int_{\hat{\mathbb{S}}} g(x)^2\,\hat{\mu}(dx) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}} g_i(x)^2\,\mu(dx) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\mathscr{E}(u\circ\tau_i, u\circ\tau_i) = \hat{\mathscr{E}}(u,u) < \infty.$$

Therefore, $g\in L^2(\hat{\mathbb{S}};\hat{\mu})$, and $\int_0^{\cdot} g(\hat{X}_r)\, d\hat{W}_r$ is a martingale additive functional of finite energy.

Furthermore, by (4.3) and Lemma 4.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{\hat{\nu}}\Big[\Big\langle \hat{M}^{[u]} - \int_0^{\cdot} g(\hat{X}_r)\,d\hat{W}_r \Big\rangle_1\Big] \\
&\quad = \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{\hat{\nu}}\big[\langle \hat{M}^{[u]}\rangle_1\big] - 2\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{\hat{\nu}}\Big[\Big\langle \hat{M}^{[u]}, \int_0^{\cdot} g(\hat{X}_r)\,d\hat{W}_r\Big\rangle_1\Big] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{\hat{\nu}}\Big[\Big\langle \int_0^{\cdot} g(\hat{X}_r)\,d\hat{W}_r\Big\rangle_1\Big] \\
&\quad = \hat{\mu}_{\langle u\rangle}(\hat{\mathbb{S}}) - 2\int_{\hat{\mathbb{S}}} g(x)\langle \mathbf{e}, \hat{\mathbf{Z}}(x)\mathbf{e}\rangle^{-1/2}\,\hat{\mu}_{\langle u, \hat{H}^0\mathbf{e}\rangle}(dx) + \int_{\hat{\mathbb{S}}} g(x)^2\,\hat{\mu}(dx) \\
&\quad = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mu_{\langle u\circ\tau_i\rangle}(\mathbb{S}) - 2\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}} g_i(x)\langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{Z}(x)\mathbf{e}\rangle^{-1/2}\,\mu_{\langle u\circ\tau_i, H^0\mathbf{e}\rangle}(dx) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}} g_i(x)^2\,\mu(dx) \\
&\quad = 2\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}_{\nu}\big[\langle M^{[u\circ\tau_i]}\rangle_1\big] - 2\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}_{\nu}\Big[\Big\langle M^{[u\circ\tau_i]}, \int_0^{\cdot} g_i(X_r)\langle \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{Z}(X_r)\mathbf{e}\rangle^{-1/2}\,dM_r^{[H^0\mathbf{e}]}\Big\rangle_1\Big] \\
&\quad = 2\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}_{\nu}\big[\langle M^{[u\circ\tau_i]}\rangle_1\big] - 2\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}_{\nu}\Big[\Big\langle M^{[u\circ\tau_i]}, \int_0^{\cdot} g_i(X_r)\,dW_r\Big\rangle_1\Big] \\
&\quad = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\hat{M}_t^{[u]} = \int_0^t g(\hat{X}_r)\,d\hat{W}_r$, $t \geq 0$. This completes the proof. □

We can now give a proof of the martingale representation theorem on the infinite Sierpinski gasket.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. It follows immediately from Proposition 4.2 and Z. Qian and J. Ying [11, Theorem 3] (see also X. Liu and Z. Qian [8, Theorem 4.8] and the remark thereafter). □

Definition 4.3. The martingale additive functional $\hat{W}$ given by (4.3) is called the *Brownian martingale* on $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$.

Definition 4.4. For any $u \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\hat{\mathbb{S}})$, its gradient is defined to be the unique element $\nabla u \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\hat{\mathbb{S}};\hat{\mu})$ such that $\hat{M}_t^{[u]} = \int_0^t \nabla u(\hat{X}_r)\,d\hat{W}_r$, $t \geq 0$.

Remark. (a) Clearly,

$$\hat{\mathscr{E}}(u,v) = \int_{\hat{\mathbb{S}}} \nabla u(x)\nabla v(x)\,\hat{\mu}(dx), \quad u,v \in \mathscr{F}(\hat{\mathbb{S}}).$$

(b) It is easily seen from the proof of Proposition 4.2 that

$$(\nabla u\circ\tau_i^{-1})|_{\mathbb{S}} = \nabla(u\circ\tau_i|_{\mathbb{S}}), \quad u \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\hat{\mathbb{S}}),$$

where $\nabla(u\circ\tau_i|_{\mathbb{S}})$ is the gradient of $u\circ\tau_i|_{\mathbb{S}}$ as an element in $\mathscr{F}(\mathbb{S})$.

4.2 Exponential Integrability of the Quadratic Variation Process

In this subsection, we prove the exponential integrability of the quadratic variation process $\langle\hat{W}\rangle$ of the Brownian martingale on $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$. We shall need the following heat kernel estimate, which was first proved in M. T. Barlow and E. A. Perkins [2, Theorem 1.5].

Lemma 4.5. *Brownian motion $\{\hat{X}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ on $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ has transition kernels $\hat{p}_t(x,y)$, $t>0$, $x,y\in\hat{\mathbb{S}}$ that are absolutely continuous with respect to $\hat{\nu}$. Moreover, there exists universal constants $C_{*,1}, C_{*,2} > 0$ such that*

$$\hat{p}_t(x,y) \leq C_{*,1}t^{-d_s/2}\exp\Big[-C_{*,2}\Big(\frac{|x-y|}{t^{1/d_w}}\Big)^{d_w/(d_w-1)}\Big],\ t\geq 0,\ x,y\in\hat{\mathbb{S}},$$

where $d_s = 2\log 3/\log 5$, $d_w = \log 5/\log 2$ are the spectral dimension *and the* walk dimension *of $\{\hat{X}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ respectively.*

Definition 4.6. For each Radon measure λ on $\hat{\mathbb{S}}$, we define

$$\hat{P}_t\lambda(x) = \int_{\hat{\mathbb{S}}} \hat{p}_t(x,y)\,\lambda(dy), \quad x \in \hat{\mathbb{S}},\ t > 0,$$

whenever the above integral exists.

Lemma 4.7. *For each $t > 0$,*

$$\hat{P}_t\hat{\mu}(x) \le C_* \max\{1, t^{-d_s/2}\}, \quad x \in \hat{\mathbb{S}},$$

where $C_* > 0$ is a universal constant.

Proof. For each $x \in \hat{\mathbb{S}}$, denote $I_n = \{i \in \mathbb{N} : \mathrm{dist}(x, \tau_i(\mathbb{S})) \le 2^n\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, $\mathrm{card}(I_n) \le 2 \cdot 3^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $t \le 1$, then, by Lemma 4.5,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{P}_t\hat{\mu}(x) &\le C_* t^{-d_s/2}\Big\{ \sum_{i\in I_0} \hat{\mu}(\tau_i(\mathbb{S})) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i\in I_{n+1}\setminus I_n} \exp\big[-C_* 2^{nd_w/(d_w-1)}\big]\hat{\mu}(\tau_i(\mathbb{S}))\Big\} \\ &\le C_* t^{-d_s/2}\Big\{1 + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 3^n \exp\big[-C_{*,2}\, 2^{nd_w/(d_w-1)}\big]\Big\},\end{aligned}$$

where $C_* > 0$ denotes a universal constant which might be different at various appearances. Note that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 3^n \exp\big[-C_{*,2}\, 2^{nd_w/(d_w-1)}\big] < \infty$. Therefore, $\|\hat{P}_t\hat{\mu}\|_{L^\infty} \le C_* t^{-d_s/2}$, $t \in (0,1]$. This implies that $\|\hat{P}_t\hat{\mu}\|_{L^\infty} \le C_* \max\{1, t^{-d_s/2}\}$, $t > 0$. □

The following can be easily shown by the same argument as that of X. Liu and Z. Qian [8, Lemma 4.17 and Corollary 4.19].

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\hat{A}^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ be positive continuous additive functionals with respect to the Hunt process $\hat{\mathbf{M}}$, and have $\hat{\mu}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ as their Revuz measures. Then, for each $t > 0$ and each $f_i \in \mathscr{B}_+([0,\infty) \times \hat{\mathbb{S}})$, $i = 1, \dots n$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{\mathbb{E}}_x\bigg(f(\hat{X}_t) \int_{0<t_1<\cdots<t_n<t} f_1(t_1, \hat{X}_{t_1}) \cdots f_n(t_n, \hat{X}_{t_n}) d\hat{A}^{(1)}_{t_1} \cdots d\hat{A}^{(n)}_{t_n}\bigg) \\ &\quad = \int_{0<t_1<\cdots<t_n<t} \hat{P}_{t_1}\big(\hat{\mu}_1 f_1(t_1,\cdot)\hat{P}_{t_2-t_1}\big(\\ &\qquad \cdots \hat{\mu}_{n-1} f_{n-1}(t_{n-1},\cdot)\hat{P}_{t_n-t_{n-1}}\big(\hat{\mu}_n f_n(t_n,\cdot)\hat{P}_{t-t_n} f\big)\cdots\big)\big)(x) dt_1 \cdots dt_n, \quad x \in \hat{\mathbb{S}}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Proposition 4.9. *For each $f \in L^1_+(\hat{\mathbb{S}}; \hat{\nu})$ and each $\beta, t > 0$,*

$$\sup_{x\in\hat{\mathbb{S}}} \hat{\mathbb{E}}_x\big(f(\hat{X}_t) e^{\beta\langle\hat{W}\rangle_t}\big) \le \max\{1, t^{-d_s/2}\}\|f\|_{L^1(\hat{\nu})} \mathrm{E}_{\gamma_s,\gamma_s}\big[C_*\,\Gamma(\gamma_s)(t+1)\beta\big],$$

where $C_* > 0$ is a universal constant, $\gamma_s = 1 - d_s/2$, $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the Gamma function, and, for each $a, b > 0$, $\mathrm{E}_{a,b}(\cdot)$ is the Mittag-Leffler function

$$\mathrm{E}_{a,b}(z) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^p}{\Gamma(ap+b)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

5 A Stochastic Maximum Principle

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.5 for the optimization problem (P) on the finite Sierpinski gasket. The proof for the finite Sierpinski gasket should be easily adapted to the infinite Sierpinski gasket by virtue of the results in Section 4. Our argument is essentially a modification of that of S. Peng [10] while overcoming some difficulties concerning the Brownian martingales on the Sierpinski gaskets. An example is also provided at the end of this section.

As we shall see, a crucial ingredient of our argument is an order comparison lemma (Lemma 5.2), which is needed when performing stochastic Taylor expansions.

5.1 Proof of the Stochastic Maximum Principle

Definition 5.1. For each $\lambda \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{S})$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and each $E \in \mathscr{B}([0,\infty))$, we denote

$$m_{k,\lambda}(E) = \mathbb{E}_\lambda\left[\left(\int_E d(t+\langle W\rangle_t)\right)^k\right].$$

Remark. Clearly, $m_{1,\lambda}$ is a Borel measure on $[0,\infty)$, and the definition of $m_{k,\lambda}(E)$ extends to all $m_{1,\lambda}$-measurable sets E.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\lambda \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{S})$, and $\{E_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ be a family of $m_{1,\lambda}$-measurable subsets of $[0,\infty)$ such that $\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} m_{1,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon) = 0$. Then*

$$m_{l,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon) = o(m_{k,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \downarrow 0,$$

for all $k,l \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $k < l$.

Proof. We only need to show that $m_{k+1,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon) = o(m_{k,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon))$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. Denote by $|E_\varepsilon|$ the Lebesgue measure of E_ε. Clearly,

$$|E_\varepsilon|^{k+1} \le |E_\varepsilon|\, m_{k,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon) \le m_{1,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon) m_{k,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon). \tag{5.1}$$

By X. Liu and Z. Qian [8, Lemma 4.17],

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left[\left(\int_{E_\varepsilon} d\langle W\rangle_t\right)^k\right] \\
&\quad = k!\,\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left(\int_0^\infty 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_1)\cdots 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_k)\, d\langle W\rangle_{t_1}\cdots d\langle W\rangle_{t_k}\right) \\
&\quad = k!\int_{\mathbb{S}}\int_{0<t_1<\cdots<t_k<\infty} P_{t_1}\big(\mu 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_1) P_{t_2-t_1}\big(\\
&\qquad\qquad \cdots \mu 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_{k-1}) P_{t_k-t_{k-1}}\big(\mu 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_k)\big)\cdots\big)\big)(x)\, dt_1\cdots dt_k \lambda(dx) \\
&\quad = k!\int_{\mathbb{S}}\int_{0<t_1<\cdots<t_k<\infty} 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_1)\cdots 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_k) P_{t_1}\big(\mu P_{t_2-t_1}\big(\cdots \mu P_{t_k-t_{k-1}}(\mu)\cdots\big)\big)(x)\, dt_1\cdots dt_k\lambda(dx),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where, for any Borel measure λ on $\mathbb{S}$,

$$P_t\lambda(x) \triangleq \int_{\mathbb{S}} p_t(x,y)\,\lambda(dy), \quad x \in \mathbb{S},$$

with $p_t(x,y)$ being the transition kernel of $\{X_t\}_{t\ge 0}$, which is jointly continuous on $\mathbb{S}\times\mathbb{S}$. By J. Kigami [6, Theorem 5.3.1], there exists a universal constant $C_* > 0$ such that

$$p_t(x,y) \le C_* \max\{1, t^{-d_s/2}\}, \quad t \in (0,\infty),\ x,y \in \mathbb{S},$$

where $d_s = 2\log 3/\log 5 < 2$ is the spectral dimension of $\{X_t\}_{t\ge 0}$. Therefore,

$$\|P_t\mu\|_{L^\infty} \le C_* \max\{1, t^{-d_s/2}\}, \quad t \in (0,\infty).$$

Moreover, by (5.2),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left[\left(\int_{E_\varepsilon} d\langle W\rangle_t\right)^{k+1}\right] \\
&\quad = (k+1)!\int_{\mathbb{S}}\int_{0<t_1<\cdots<t_{k+1}<\infty} 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_1)\cdots 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_{k+1}) \\
&\qquad\qquad \times P_{t_1}\big(\mu P_{t_2-t_1}\big(\cdots \mu P_{t_{k+1}-t_k}(\mu)\cdots\big)\big)(x)\, dt_1\cdots dt_{k+1}\lambda(dx) \\
&\quad \le C_*(k+1)!\int_{\mathbb{S}}\int_{0<t_1<\cdots<t_{k+1}<\infty} 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_1)\cdots 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_{k+1}) \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \max\{1,(t_{k+1}-t_k)^{-d_s/2}\} P_{t_1}\big(\mu P_{t_2-t_1}\big(\cdots \mu P_{t_k-t_{k-1}}(\mu)\cdots\big)\big)(x)\, dt_1\cdots dt_{k+1}\lambda(dx).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Note that, for E_ε with $m_{1,x}(E_\varepsilon) \le 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{t_k}^{\infty} 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_{k+1}) \max\{1, (t_{k+1}-t_k)^{-d_s/2}\}\, dt_{k+1} \\
&\quad \le \int_{t_k}^{t_k + m_{1,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)} (t_{k+1}-t_k)^{-d_s/2}\, dt_{k+1} + m_{1,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{-d_s/2} \int_0^{\infty} 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_{k+1})\, dt_{k+1} \\
&\quad = \frac{2-d_s/2}{1-d_s/2} m_{1,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{1-d_s/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, the bound $\frac{2-d_s/2}{1-d_s/2} m_{1,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{1-d_s/2}$ is independent of $t_k \in (0,\infty)$.

By (5.3) and the above,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left[\left(\int_{E_\varepsilon} d\langle W\rangle_t\right)^{k+1}\right] \\
&\quad \le C_*(k+1)!\, m_{1,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{1-d_s/2} \int_{\mathbb{S}} \int_{0<t_1<\cdots<t_k<\infty} 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_1)\cdots 1_{E_\varepsilon}(t_k) \\
&\qquad\qquad P_{t_1}\big(\mu P_{t_2-t_1}\big(\cdots \mu P_{t_k-t_{k-1}}(\mu)\cdots\big)\big)(x)\, dt_1\cdots dt_k \lambda(dx) \\
&\quad = C_*(k+1)\, m_{1,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{1-d_s/2} m_{k,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (5.1), implies that $m_{k+1,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon) \le C m_{1,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{1-d_s/2} m_{k,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)$. This completes the proof. □

We shall also need the following estimate for solutions of linear SDEs driven by the Brownian martingale W.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\{Y_t\}$ be the solution of the SDE*

$$\begin{cases} dY_t = (a_1(t)Y_t + \alpha_1(t))dt + (a_2(t)Y_t + \alpha_2(t))d\langle W\rangle_t \\ \qquad\quad + (b(t) + \beta(t))dW_t, \qquad t \in [0,T], \\ Y_0 = \xi. \end{cases}$$

Suppose that

$$|\varphi(t)| \le M \quad \text{for } \varphi = a_1, a_2, b,$$

where $M > 0$ is a constant. Then, for each $\lambda \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{S})$ and each $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left(\sup_{0\le t\le T} |Y_t|^{2k} \mathrm{e}_t^{-1} + \int_0^T |Y_t|^{2k} \mathrm{e}_t^{-1} d\langle W\rangle_t\right) \\
&\qquad \le C\,\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left[|\xi|^{2k} + \left(\int_0^T |\alpha_1(t)|dt\right)^{2k} + \left(\int_0^T |\alpha_2(t)|d\langle W\rangle_t\right)^{2k} + \left(\int_0^T |\beta(t)|^2 d\langle W\rangle_t\right)^k\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

where $\mathrm{e}_t = \exp\big(k_1 t + k_2\langle W\rangle_t\big)$ with $k_1 = 2kM$, $k_2 = 8k^2(M+1)^2$, and $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on k, M.

Proof. By Itô's formula,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|Y_t|^{2k}\mathrm{e}_t^{-1} \\
&\quad = |\xi|^{2k} + \int_0^t \big[2kY_r^{2k-1}(a_1(r)Y_r+\alpha_1(r)) - k_1|Y_r|^{2k}\big]\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}dr \\
&\qquad + \int_0^t \big[2kY_r^{2k-1}(a_2(r)Y_r+\alpha_2(r)) + k(2k-1)Y_r^{2k-2}(b(r)Y_r+\beta(r))^2 - k_2|Y_r|^{2k}\big]\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}d\langle W\rangle_r \\
&\qquad + \int_0^t 2kY_r^{2k-1}(b(r)Y_r+\beta(r))\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}dW_r \\
&\quad \le |\xi|^{2k} + \int_0^t 2k|Y_r|^{2k-1}|\alpha_1(r)|\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}dr \\
&\qquad + \int_0^t \big[(2kM+4k^2M^2-k_2)|Y_r|^{2k} + 2k|Y_r|^{2k-1}|\alpha_2(r)| + 4k^2|Y_r|^{2k-2}|\beta(r)|^2\big]\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}d\langle W\rangle_r \\
&\qquad + \left|\int_0^t 2kY_r^{2k-1}(b(r)Y_r+\beta(r))\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}dW_r\right|.
\end{aligned}
$$

Denote $Z = \sup_{0\le t\le T}|Y_t|\mathrm{e}_t^{-1/(2k)}$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
Z^{2k} &\le |\xi|^{2k} + 2kZ^{2k-1}\left(\int_0^T |\alpha_1(t)|dt + \int_0^T |\alpha_2(t)|d\langle W\rangle_t\right) \\
&\qquad + 4k^2Z^{2k-2}\int_0^T |\beta(t)|^2 d\langle W\rangle_t + (2kM+4k^2M^2-k_2)\int_0^T |Y_r|^{2k}\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}d\langle W\rangle_r \\
&\qquad + \sup_{0\le t\le T}\left|\int_0^t 2kY_r^{2k-1}(b(r)Y_r+\beta(r))\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}dW_r\right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}
$$

By the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left(\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left|\int_0^t Y_r^{2k-1}(b(r)Y_r+\beta(r))\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}dW_r\right|\right) \\
&\quad \le C_*\,\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left[\left(\int_0^T \big(M^2|Y_r|^{4k} + |Y_r|^{4k-2}|\beta(r)|^2\big)\mathrm{e}_r^{-2}d\langle W\rangle_r\right)^{1/2}\right] \\
&\quad \le C_*\,\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left[MZ^k\left(\int_0^T |Y_r|^{2k}\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}d\langle W\rangle_r\right)^{1/2} + Z^{2k-1}\left(\int_0^T |\beta(r)|^2 d\langle W\rangle_r\right)^{1/2}\right] \\
&\quad \le C_*\,\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left[(\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_2)Z^{2k} + \frac{M}{\varepsilon_1}\int_0^T |Y_r|^{2k}\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}d\langle W\rangle_r + \frac{1}{2k\varepsilon_2^{2k-1}}\left(\int_0^T |\beta(r)|^2 d\langle W\rangle_r\right)^k\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

where $C_*>0$ is a universal constant. Choosing $\varepsilon_1 = 1/4$ and $\varepsilon_2>0$ sufficiently small gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left(\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left|\int_0^t Y_r^{2k-1}(b(r)Y_r+\beta(r))\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}dW_r\right|\right) \\
&\qquad \le \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_\lambda\big(Z^{2k}\big) + \mathbb{E}_\lambda\left[4M\int_0^T |Y_r|^{2k}\mathrm{e}_r^{-1}d\langle W\rangle_r + C\left(\int_0^T |\beta(r)|^2 d\langle W\rangle_r\right)^k\right],
\end{aligned}
$$

where $C>0$ denotes a constant depending only on k, M. Since $k_2 > 4M+2kM+4k^2M^2$, (5.4) follows easily from the above and (5.5) and Young's inequality. □

We now turn to the derivation of the stochastic maximum principle. Suppose that $\bar{u}\in\mathscr{A}[0,T]$ is a minimizer of (P), and $\bar{x}(\cdot)$ is the corresponding controlled process. Let $\{E_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ be an arbitrary family of $m_{1,\lambda}$-measurable subsets of $[0,T]$ such that $\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} m_{1,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon) = 0$.

Let $A \subseteq [0,\infty)\times\Omega$ be an optional set such that $\mathfrak{M}_1$ is supported on A and $\mathfrak{M}_2$ is supported on $([0,\infty)\times\Omega)\backslash A$. For arbitrary $u_1, u_2 \in \mathscr{A}[0,T]$, let

$$u^\varepsilon(t,\omega) = \begin{cases} \bar{u}(t,\omega) & \text{if } (t,\omega) \in ([0,T]\backslash E_\varepsilon)\times\Omega, \\ u_1(t,\omega) & \text{if } (t,\omega) \in (E_\varepsilon\times\Omega)\cap A, \\ u_2(t,\omega) & \text{if } (t,\omega) \in (E_\varepsilon\times\Omega)\backslash A. \end{cases}$$

We denote by $x^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ the controlled process corresponding to $u^\varepsilon(\cdot)$, and let

$$\xi^\varepsilon = x^\varepsilon - \bar{x}. \tag{5.6}$$

Define the *first-order approximating* process $y^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ by

$$\begin{cases} dy^\varepsilon(t) = \partial_x b_1(t) y^\varepsilon(t)dt + \partial_x b_2(t) y^\varepsilon(t) d\langle W\rangle_t + \big(\delta\sigma(t) + \partial_x\sigma(t) y^\varepsilon(t)\big) dW_t, \\ y^\varepsilon(0) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{5.7}$$

and the *second-order approximating* process $z^\varepsilon(\cdot)$ by

$$\begin{cases} dz^\varepsilon(t) = \Big[\partial_x b_1(t) z^\varepsilon(t) + \delta b_1(t) + \dfrac{1}{2}\partial_x^2 b_1(t) y^\varepsilon(t)^2\Big] dt \\ \qquad\qquad + \Big[\partial_x b_2(t) z^\varepsilon(t) + \delta b_2(t) + \dfrac{1}{2}\partial_x^2 b_2(t) y^\varepsilon(t)^2\Big] d\langle W\rangle_t \\ \qquad\qquad + \Big[\partial_x\sigma(t) z^\varepsilon(t) + \delta(\partial_x\sigma)(t) y^\varepsilon(t) + \dfrac{1}{2}\partial_x^2\sigma(t) y^\varepsilon(t)^2\Big] dW_t, \\ z^\varepsilon(0) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{5.8}$$

where, for any function $\varphi : [0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{U}\to\mathbb{R}$, we denote

$$\varphi(t) = \varphi(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t)),\ \delta\varphi(t) = \varphi(t,\bar{x}(t),u^\varepsilon(t)) - \varphi(t,\bar{x}(t),\bar{u}(t)) \quad t \geq 0.$$

Clearly, $\mathrm{Supp}(\delta\varphi) \subseteq E_\varepsilon$.

Lemma 5.4. *For each $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_\lambda\Big(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |\xi^\varepsilon(t)|^{2k}\Big) = O\big(m_{2k,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{1/2}\big), \tag{5.9}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_\lambda\Big(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |y^\varepsilon(t)|^{2k}\Big) = O\big(m_{2k,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{1/2}\big), \tag{5.10}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_\lambda\Big(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |z^\varepsilon(t)|^{2k}\Big) = O\big(m_{4k,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{1/2}\big), \tag{5.11}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_\lambda\Big(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |\xi^\varepsilon(t) - y^\varepsilon(t)|^{2k}\Big) = O\big(m_{4k,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{1/2}\big), \tag{5.12}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_\lambda\Big(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |\xi^\varepsilon(t) - y^\varepsilon(t) - z^\varepsilon(t)|^{2k}\Big) = o\big(m_{4k,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{1/2}\big), \tag{5.13}$$

as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

Proof. For any function $\varphi : [0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{U}\to\mathbb{R}$, denote

$$\tilde{\varphi}(t) = \int_0^1 \varphi(t,\theta\bar{x}(t) + (1-\theta)x^\varepsilon(t), u^\varepsilon(t))\, d\theta, \quad t \geq 0.$$

By (3.8),

$$\begin{cases} d\xi^\varepsilon(t) = \big[\widetilde{\partial_x b_1}(t)\xi^\varepsilon(t) + \delta b_1(t)\big]dt + \big[\widetilde{\partial_x b_2}(t)\xi^\varepsilon(t) + \delta b_2(t)\big]d\langle W\rangle_t \\ \qquad\qquad + \big[\widetilde{\partial_x \sigma}(t)\xi^\varepsilon(t) + \delta\sigma(t)\big]dW_t, \qquad t \geq 0, \\ \xi^\varepsilon(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Since $\mathrm{Supp}(\delta\varphi) \subseteq E_\varepsilon,\ \varphi = b_1, b_2, \sigma$, by Lemma 5.3,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_\lambda\Big(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|\xi^\varepsilon(t)|^{4k}\mathrm{e}_t^{-1}\Big) \\ &\quad\leq C\mathbb{E}_\lambda\bigg[\Big(\int_0^T|\delta b_1(t)|dt\Big)^{4k} + \Big(\int_0^T|\delta b_2(t)|d\langle W\rangle_t\Big)^{4k} + \Big(\int_0^T|\delta\sigma(t)|^2 d\langle W\rangle_t\Big)^{2k}\bigg] \\ &\quad\leq C m_{2k,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where $C>0$ denotes a constant depending only on k, M, but might be different at various appearances. Therefore, (5.9) follows immediately from

$$\mathbb{E}_\lambda\Big(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|\xi^\varepsilon(t)|^{2k}\Big) \leq \Big[\mathbb{E}_\lambda\Big(\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|\xi^\varepsilon(t)|^{4k}\mathrm{e}_t^{-1}\Big)\Big]^{1/2}\big[\mathbb{E}_\lambda(\mathrm{e}_T)\big]^{1/2}$$

and the fact that $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{S}}\mathbb{E}_x(\mathrm{e}_T)<\infty$.

Estimates (5.10)-(5.13) can be shown similarly. □

Proof of Theorem 3.5. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} &J(u^\varepsilon) - J(\bar u) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\lambda\bigg\{\partial_x h(\bar x(T))\xi^\varepsilon(T) + \int_0^1\theta\partial_x^2 h(\theta\bar x(T) + (1-\theta)x^\varepsilon(T))d\theta\cdot\xi^\varepsilon(T)^2 \\ &\quad + \int_0^T\bigg[\delta f_1(t) + \partial_x f_1(t,\bar x(t),u^\varepsilon(t))\xi^\varepsilon(t) + \int_0^1\theta\partial_x^2 f_1(t,\theta\bar x(t)+(1-\theta)x^\varepsilon(t),u^\varepsilon(t))d\theta\cdot\xi^\varepsilon(t)^2\bigg]dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^T\bigg[\delta f_2(t) + \partial_x f_2(t,\bar x(t),u^\varepsilon(t))\xi^\varepsilon(t) + \int_0^1\theta\partial_x^2 f_2(t,\theta\bar x(t)+(1-\theta)x^\varepsilon(t),u^\varepsilon(t))d\theta\cdot\xi^\varepsilon(t)^2\bigg]d\langle W\rangle_t\bigg\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\lambda\bigg\{-p(T)(y^\varepsilon(T)+z^\varepsilon(T)) - \frac{1}{2}P(T)y^\varepsilon(T)^2 \\ &\quad + \int_0^T\Big[\delta f_1(t) + \partial_x f_1(t)(y^\varepsilon(t)+z^\varepsilon(t)) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x^2 f_1(t)y^\varepsilon(t)^2\Big]dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^T\Big[\delta f_2(t) + \partial_x f_2(t)(y^\varepsilon(t)+z^\varepsilon(t)) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x^2 f_2(t)y^\varepsilon(t)^2\Big]d\langle W\rangle_t\bigg\} + o\big(m_{2,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)\big)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.10),

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_\lambda\big[p(T)(y^\varepsilon(T)+z^\varepsilon(T))\big] \\ &\quad= \mathbb{E}_\lambda\bigg\{\int_0^T\Big[\delta b_1(t)p(t) + \partial_x f_1(t)\big(y^\varepsilon(t)+z^\varepsilon(t)\big) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_x^2 b_1(t)p(t)y^\varepsilon(t)^2\Big]dt \\ &\qquad + \int_0^T\Big[\delta b_2(t)p(t) + \delta\sigma(t)q(t) + \partial_x f_2(t)\big(y^\varepsilon(t)+z^\varepsilon(t)\big) \\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{2}\big[\partial_x^2 b_2(t)p(t)y^\varepsilon(t)^2 + \partial_x^2\sigma(t)q(t)\big]y^\varepsilon(t)^2 + \delta(\partial_x\sigma)(t)q(t)y^\varepsilon(t)\Big]d\langle W\rangle_t\bigg\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\lambda\big[p(T)(y^\varepsilon(T)+z^\varepsilon(T))\big]\\
&\quad=\mathbb{E}_\lambda\bigg\{\int_0^T\Big[\delta b_1(t)p(t)+\partial_x f_1(t)\big(y^\varepsilon(t)+z^\varepsilon(t)\big)+\frac{1}{2}\partial_x^2 b_1(t)p(t)y^\varepsilon(t)^2\Big]dt\\
&\qquad+\int_0^T\Big[\delta b_2(t)p(t)+\delta\sigma(t)q(t)+\partial_x f_2(t)\big(y^\varepsilon(t)+z^\varepsilon(t)\big)\\
&\qquad+\frac{1}{2}\big[\partial_x^2 b_2(t)p(t)y^\varepsilon(t)^2+\partial_x^2\sigma(t)q(t)\big]y^\varepsilon(t)^2\Big]\,d\langle W\rangle_t\bigg\}+o\big(m_{2,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{1/2}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&J(u^\varepsilon)-J(\bar u)\\
&=\mathbb{E}_\lambda\bigg\{-\frac{1}{2}P(T)y^\varepsilon(T)^2+\int_0^T\Big[\delta f_1(t)-\delta b_1(t)p(t)+\frac{1}{2}\big[\partial_x^2 f_1(t)-\partial_x^2 b_1(t)\big]y^\varepsilon(t)^2\Big]dt\\
&\quad+\int_0^T\Big[\delta f_2(t)-\delta b_2(t)p(t)-\delta\sigma(t)q(t)+\frac{1}{2}\big[\partial_x^2 f_2(t)-\partial_x^2 b_2(t)p(t)-\partial_x^2\sigma(t)q(t)\big]y^\varepsilon(t)^2\Big]d\langle W\rangle_t\bigg\}\\
&\quad+o\big(m_{2,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)\big)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by (3.11),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\lambda\big[P(T)y^\varepsilon(T)^2\big]\\
&\quad=\mathbb{E}_\lambda\bigg\{\int_0^T\big[\partial_x^2 f_1(t)-\partial_x^2 b_1(t)p(t)\big]y^\varepsilon(t)^2dt\\
&\qquad+\int_0^T\Big[\big[\partial_x^2 f_2(t)-\partial_x^2 b_2(t)p(t)-\partial_x^2\sigma(t)q(t)\big]y^\varepsilon(t)^2+\delta\sigma(t)^2P(t)\\
&\qquad+\big[2\partial_x\sigma(t)P(t)+Q(t)\big]\delta\sigma(t)y^\varepsilon(t)\Big]\,d\langle W\rangle_t\bigg\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_\lambda\big[P(T)y^\varepsilon(T)^2\big]\\
&\quad=\mathbb{E}_\lambda\bigg\{\int_0^T\big[\partial_x^2 f_1(t)-\partial_x^2 b_1(t)p(t)\big]y^\varepsilon(t)^2dt\\
&\qquad+\int_0^T\Big[\big[\partial_x^2 f_2(t)-\partial_x^2 b_2(t)p(t)-\partial_x^2\sigma(t)q(t)\big]y^\varepsilon(t)^2+\delta\sigma(t)^2P(t)\Big]\,d\langle W\rangle_t\bigg\}\\
&\qquad+o\big(m_{2,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)^{1/2}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&J(u^\varepsilon)-J(\bar u)\\
&\quad=\mathbb{E}_\lambda\bigg\{\int_0^T\Big[\delta f_1(t)-\delta b_1(t)p(t)\Big]dt\\
&\qquad+\int_0^T\Big[\delta f_2(t)-\delta b_2(t)p(t)-\delta\sigma(t)q(t)-\frac{1}{2}\delta\sigma(t)^2P(t)\Big]d\langle W\rangle_t\bigg\}+o\big(m_{2,\lambda}(E_\varepsilon)\big)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By optimality, it follows that

$$\begin{cases}
\delta f_1(t)-\delta b_1(t)p(t)\geq 0 & \text{a.e. } t\in[0,T],\\
\delta f_2(t)-\delta b_2(t)p(t)-\delta\sigma(t)q(t)-\dfrac{1}{2}\delta\sigma(t)^2P(t)\geq 0 & Q_\lambda\text{-a.e. } t\in[0,T],
\end{cases}$$

which completes the proof in view of the arbitrariness of $u_1(\cdot),u_2(\cdot)$ and $\{E_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$. □

5.2 Example

We end this section with an example. Let $\lambda \in \mathscr{P}(\mathbb{S})$ with $\lambda \ll \nu$ and $a > 0$, and take as the decision space $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{R}$. We consider the following *linear regulator problem*, which has wide applications in mathematical finance and engineering (see W. H. Fleming and R. W. Rishel [4, p. 23] and references therein):

$$\underset{u\in\mathscr{A}[0,1]}{\text{minimize}}\ \mathbb{E}_\lambda\left(\frac{a}{2}\int_0^1 u(t)^2dt + x(1)^2\right), \tag{5.14}$$

with

$$\begin{cases} dx(t) = u(t)dt + u(t)d\langle W\rangle_t + u(t)dW_t, \quad t\in(0,1], \\ x(0) = 1. \end{cases} \tag{5.15}$$

Suppose that $(\bar{x}(\cdot),\bar{u}(\cdot))$ is an optimal pair of the problem (5.14). The adjoint equations are

$$\begin{cases} dp(t) = q(t)dW_t, \quad t\in[0,1), \\ p(1) = -2\bar{x}(1), \end{cases} \tag{5.16}$$

$$\begin{cases} dP(t) = Q(t)dW_t, \quad t\in[0,1), \\ P(1) = -2. \end{cases} \tag{5.17}$$

Clearly, $P(t) = -2,\ Q(t) = 0$ is the solution of (5.17).

The Hamiltonians are

$$H_1(t,x,u) = up(t) - \frac{a}{2}u^2,\ H_2(t,x,u) = u[p(t)+q(t)] - (u-\bar{u}(t))^2.$$

Let $\mathfrak{M}_1,\mathfrak{M}_2$ be the measures on $[0,\infty)\times\Omega$ given by (3.13) and (3.14), and $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}_1 + \mathfrak{M}_2$. By Theorem 3.5,

$$\bar{u}(t)\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_1}{d\mathfrak{M}} = \frac{p(t)}{a}\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_1}{d\mathfrak{M}},$$

and

$$\bar{u}(t)\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_2}{d\mathfrak{M}} = \frac{p(t)+q(t)+2\bar{u}(t)}{2}\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_2}{d\mathfrak{M}},$$

which implies that

$$q(t) = -p(t), \quad \mathfrak{M}_2\text{-a.e.}$$

It follows from the above and (5.16) that

$$p(t) = p(0)\exp\left(-W_t - \frac{1}{2}\langle W\rangle_t\right), \quad t\in[0,1]. \tag{5.18}$$

Therefore, $(\bar{x}(\cdot),\bar{u}(\cdot),p(0))$ is given by the system

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{x}(t) = \dfrac{p(t)}{a}dt + \bar{u}(t)d\langle W\rangle_t + \bar{u}(t)dW_t, \quad t\in(0,1], \\ \bar{x}(0) = 1, \quad \bar{x}(1) = -\dfrac{1}{2}p(1), \end{cases} \tag{5.19}$$

where $p(\cdot)$ is given by (5.18). Note that, compared to BSDEs, the system (5.19) takes the random variable $p(0)$ as a part of its solution so that the additional condition $\bar{x}(0) = 1$ is satisfied. Therefore, (5.19) is not a simple SDE or BSDE but a forward-backward type SDE.

We now look for a solution of the form $\bar{x}(t) = \theta(t)p(t)$, where $\theta(t)$ is a process of the form

$$\begin{cases} d\theta(t) = \xi_1(t)dt + \xi_2(t)d\langle W\rangle_t + \eta(t)dW_t, \quad t \in [0,1), \\ \theta(1) = -\dfrac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

By Itô's formula,

$$d\bar{x}(t) = \xi_1(t)p(t)dt + [\xi_2(t) - \eta(t)]p(t)d\langle W\rangle_t + [\eta(t) - \theta(t)]p(t)dW_t, \quad t \in (0,1].$$

Comparing the above with (5.19) gives that

$$\xi_1(t)p(t)\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_1}{d\mathfrak{M}} = \frac{p(t)}{a}\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_1}{d\mathfrak{M}},$$

$$[\xi_2(t) - \eta(t)]p(t)\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_2}{d\mathfrak{M}} = \bar{u}(t)\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_2}{d\mathfrak{M}} = [\eta(t) - \theta(t)]p(t)\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_2}{d\mathfrak{M}}.$$

Therefore, $\xi_1(t) = \frac{1}{a}$ $\mathfrak{M}_1$-a.e. and $\xi_2(t) = 2\eta(t) - \theta(t)$ $\mathfrak{M}_2$-a.e. Furthermore, $\theta(t)$ is given by the BSDE

$$\begin{cases} d\theta(t) = \dfrac{1}{a}dt + [2\eta(t) - \theta(t)]d\langle W\rangle_t + \eta(t)dW_t, \quad t \in [0,1), \\ \theta(1) = -\dfrac{1}{2}, \end{cases} \tag{5.20}$$

of which the solution $(\theta(\cdot), \eta(\cdot))$ exists and is unique by virtue of Theorem 3.3.

For the moment, let us assume that $\theta(0) < 0$. Then by $\bar{x}(0) = \theta(0)p(0) = 1$, we have that $p(0) = 1/\theta(0)$ and

$$p(t) = \frac{1}{\theta(0)}\exp\Big(-W_t - \frac{1}{2}\langle W\rangle_t\Big). \tag{5.21}$$

The optimal pair $(\bar{x}(\cdot), \bar{u}(\cdot))$ is given by

$$\bar{u}(t) = \frac{p(t)}{a}\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_1}{d\mathfrak{M}} + [\eta(t) - \theta(t)]p(t)\frac{d\mathfrak{M}_2}{d\mathfrak{M}}, \tag{5.22}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{x}(t) = \dfrac{p(t)}{a}dt + [\eta(t) - \theta(t)]p(t)d\langle W\rangle_t + [\eta(t) - \theta(t)]p(t)dW_t, \quad t \in (0,1], \\ \bar{x}(0) = 1, \end{cases} \tag{5.23}$$

where $(\theta(\cdot), \eta(\cdot))$ and $p(\cdot)$ are given by (5.20) and (5.21).

It remains to show that $\theta(0) < 0$. Let

$$\Phi(t) = \exp\Big(-2W_t - \langle W\rangle_t\Big), \quad t \in [0,1].$$

By Itô's formula,

$$d\Phi(t) = \Phi(t)d\langle W\rangle_t - 2\Phi(t)dW_t.$$

Therefore,

$$d[\Phi(t)\theta(t)] = \frac{\Phi(t)}{a}dt + \Phi(t)[\eta(t) - 2\theta(t)]dW_t,$$

which implies that $\Phi(t)\theta(t) - \frac{1}{a}\int_0^t \Phi(r)dr$ is a martingale. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Phi(t)\theta(t) - \frac{1}{a}\int_0^t \Phi(r)dr \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}_\lambda\left(\Phi(1)\theta(1) - \frac{1}{a}\int_0^1 \Phi(r)dr \,\middle|\, \mathscr{F}_t\right) \\
&\quad = -\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left(\frac{\Phi(1)}{2} + \frac{1}{a}\int_0^1 \Phi(r)dr \,\middle|\, \mathscr{F}_t\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which gives that

$$\theta(t) = -\Phi(t)^{-1}\mathbb{E}_\lambda\left(\frac{\Phi(1)}{2} + \frac{1}{a}\int_t^1 \Phi(r)dr \,\middle|\, \mathscr{F}_t\right). \tag{5.24}$$

This, together with the fact that $\Phi(t) > 0$, shows that $\theta(0) < 0$.

References

[1] M. Ausloos, K. Ivanova, and N. Vandewalle. Crashes: Symptoms, diagnoses and remedies. In *Empirical Science of Financial Fluctuations*, pages 62–76. Springer, 2002.

[2] M. T. Barlow and E. A. Perkins. Brownian motion on the Sierpinski gasket. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 79(4):543–623, 1988.

[3] Y. Dong and J. Wang. Complex system analysis of market return percolation model on Sierpinski carpet lattice fractal. *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, 27(4):743–759, 2014.

[4] W. H. Fleming and R. W. Rishel. *Deterministic and Stochastic Optimal Control*, volume 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[5] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima, and M. Takeda. *Dirichlet Forms and Symmetric Markov Processes*, volume 19 of *De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. De Gruyter, 2 edition, 2010.

[6] J. Kigami. *Analysis on Fractals*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics (143). Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[7] S. Kusuoka. Dirichlet forms on fractals and products of random matrices. *Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences*, 25(4):659–680, 1989.

[8] X. Liu and Z. Qian. Brownian motion on the Sierpinski gasket and related stochastic differential equations. *Preprint, arXiv:1612.01297*, 2016.

[9] B. B. Mandelbrot. *Fractals and Scaling in Finance: Discontinuity, Concentration, Risk. Selecta Volume E*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[10] S. Peng. A general stochastic maximum principle for optimal control problems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 28(4):966–979, 1990.

[11] Z. Qian and J. Ying. Martingale representations for diffusion processes and backward stochastic differential equations. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XLIV*, pages 75–103. Springer, 2012.

[12] J. Yong and X. Zhou. *Stochastic Controls: Hamiltonian Systems and HJB Equations*, volume 43. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.